Chancel screens on the eve of the Reformation

Lucy J. Wrapson

Introduction

England's medieval chancel or rood screens divided the nave from the chancel, the public part of the church from that of the priest; the earthly from the divine. Rather than acting as a practical physical barrier (they did not always have central doors) they functioned more as a spiritual one, providing a frame for the theatre of the Mass.[1] The earliest surviving parochial examples of these colourful, multivalent and multi-functional structures are thirteenth and fourteenth century in date.[2] By the late-fifteenth century, they were nigh on ubiquitous.

Rood screens were previously part of a larger varied ensemble of which much has been destroyed, specifically the great Crucifix (Rood), its flanking figures such as Mary and John the Evangelist (and sometimes the good and bad thieves), all of which formerly stood on the rood loft or were suspended over it (Fig. 1). Only a very few Roods or fragments of them have survived the Reformation; all of them are separated from their original context. Rather more lofts survive; St Mary's, Attleborough (Norfolk), St Edith's, Coates by Stow (Lincs), and St Mary's, Atherington (Devon) being some examples. It is, however, necessary to look to Brittany or to Sir Ninian Comper's restored screens at St Peter and St Paul, Eye or St John the Baptist's, Lound, in Suffolk to help imagine what England's once colourful and elaborate screens might have looked like with their sculptures and parapets intact.[3]

With one or two exceptions, these structures were not termed 'screens' until the seventeenth century, following the removal of their Roods and lofts, a term likely to derive from un-lofted domestic partitions. In contemporary late-medieval records,

they were known as rood lofts, perkes, sollers, pulpita, allures, and candlebeams.[4] These terms varied according to each English region, but they habitually referenced the gallery or loft, since taken down. The original terminology emphasises the importance of the upper gallery and its access to the Rood. Reformation period dismantling means that no single term fully conveys both what is left now and what was intended originally. In this article, I therefore use the term 'rood screen', a nineteenth-century confection popularised during the 1848 rood-screen controversy, and the term 'chancel screen', which suggests a purpose to screen the chancel, interchangeably, acknowledging the problems with both.

Two English regions are known for retaining the largest numbers of screens, both painted and now stripped of their original paint, East Anglia, particularly the county of Norfolk and the West Country, specifically the county of Devon. There are other regions with significant numbers of extant screens, notably on both sides of the border in the Welsh Marches.[5] The prevalence of often retro-fitted rood loft stairs in now-screenless medieval churches from Cumberland to Cornwall is a testament to their near ubiquity by the late Middle Ages. Although there are compelling reasons why the West Country and East Anglia might have had large numbers of screens by the fifteenth century (wealth leading to widespread later medieval church building and rebuilding perhaps being one), the survival of pre-Reformation screenwork can be as much to do with their post-Reformation treatment as anything. In a particularly well-documented case, within ten years, between 1727 and 1737, seventy-one medieval screens were taken down in Yorkshire, leaving that county with few surviving screens, despite noteworthy examples at St Michael and All Angels, Hubberholme and St Oswald's, Flamborough.[6]

Identifying Tudor screens

Is it possible to establish what constitutes a surviving English screen on the 'eve of the Reformation'? The answer for the region I have personally studied most, East Anglia is yes. Nonetheless, establishing a secure chronology for East Anglian screens is complex.[7] Some dates can be found inscribed on screens, in records of inscriptions collected by antiquaries, in wills bequeathing money to their creation, and in churchwardens' accounts. With all these strands of data taken together, there is dating evidence for about 20% of screens in East Anglia, with greater or lesser precision depending on the source.[8] Dating Devon's screens is hampered by the loss of its historical wills in the bombing of its record office in World War II, although it is thought few pre-Reformation wills survived in any case.[9] Despite this, its *c.*140 screens can be examined in the light of twelve dated examples (about 9% of surviving screens).[10]

By relating this framework to aspects of construction and painting, which I have done for East Anglian screens, it is possible then to group stylistically-related works around existing dates, even to the extent of identifying the work of specific workshops of both carpentry and painting.[11] This approach is, however, not without its difficulties and uncertainties. As chancel screens were large, expensive, composite structures, they were often the product of parish fundraising and could take decades to complete.[12] Where screens are dated by painted inscription, this marks the end of a long story of construction and decoration, which were separate processes involving distinct craftsmen. This separation of the crafts is indicated by the habitual presence of barbs of paint (known as 'mahlrands') which indicate that rood screens were painted once they had been constructed, as well as by the identifiable outputs of both carpentry and painting workshops which rarely overlap.[13]

As I have explored elsewhere,[14] a significant change in woodworking technique helps the dating of screens and can also assist in dating undated examples. Charles Tracy and Hugh Harrison were first to note a change in carpentry jointing techniques in continental wood-working in their study of choir stalls at Amiens Cathedral.[15] Following that, Tim Howson in his 2009 study of the woodwork of Suffolk screens noted that there are two main approaches to jointing the junction between transom and stanchion on fifteenth and sixteenth century perpendicular style screens in East Anglia.[16] After surveying about forty Norfolk and Suffolk screens and comparing them to known and dated will bequests, he concluded that mason's mitre joints, an earlier joint type, were superseded by scribed joints and that this reflected an innovation in technique on the continent as described by Tracy and Harrison.

I have since compiled about a hundred examples of dated screens and their transom jointing methods via site visits in East Anglia (Fig. 2). This work has confirmed that the scribed transom to stanchion joint was first used in the 1480s and was used invariably after 1505. The period from *c.*1480 until *c.*1500 was one where both jointing techniques were used, as well as a hybridised version of the two, with the scribed joint finding increasing favour (though mason's mitre joints did continue to be used). The earliest dated scribed joint I have found dates to 1474, but it is by *c.*1485 that they became more widespread.[17]

The significance of this is that an undated East Anglian screen with scribed joints is likely to have been made *c.*1485–1536. This transition coincides with the beginning of the Tudor period and so a study of scribed-jointed screens and their painted schemes is effectively a study of screens on the eve of the Reformation. It is clear from screens in other parts of England that this change happened elsewhere, although at what date and through what route is uncertain. As the work of Harrison

and West has shown these technical changes also came about in the West Country where there are also both mason's mitre and scribe-jointed screens.[18] When Devon's scribe-jointed screens are examined closely in terms of other characteristics such as their carpentry and painting style, it is credible that they too date from the late fifteenth through to the sixteenth century.

Iconographic, material and stylistic characteristics of Tudor-period screens

Having established how to identify a relevant body of surviving screens, this paper now concentrates on figurative screens of the Tudor period, that is on scribed-jointed screens dating from around 1485 until the Reformation, and on those hybrid and mason's mitre-jointed screens with Tudor period will-bequest dates.[19] I first compare Plantagenet and Tudor period screens to see whether there are any definable differences. While this effort concentrates on East Anglian screens, I also demonstrate some of the regional differences still discernible between parochial chancel screens in England, particularly in terms of continental stylistic influences.

Once the compartmentalised perpendicular style screen had been developed in the early fifteenth century, its iconography and decoration followed quite clearly-defined patterns and traditions, as exemplified by the rood screen at St James', Castle Acre in Norfolk, which probably dates to *c*.1420–40.[20] The Apostles were the earliest figures represented on the lower reaches or dados of screens, likely because of an overall change in the association of the lower parts of the chancel screen with the great Rood and especially with themes of the Passion, judgement and redemption, connected vertically to the Last Judgement in the form of a chancel arch wall painting or wooden tympanum. At St Michael's, Irstead in Norfolk, the fourteenth-century screen bears two designs, one earlier than the other. Infrared photography makes more

visible an underlying crown of thorns design on the screen, which has been updated to depict the Apostles, likely in the fifteenth century. At All Saints, Edingthorpe in Norfolk, a decorative scheme was also later updated to depict an apocopated Apostle-set of six saints. Many of the earlier subdivided screens were seemingly designed with twelve compartments in order to carry the Apostles.

Yet by the time that figurative painting became common practice on screen dados by the mid-fifteenth century, there was flexibility as to who was represented, and screens could swell to hold more figures. Eamon Duffy has written extensively on the subject of saints on rood screens, and on the patronage affecting their selection, comparing Devon and East Anglia. He concludes that the guiding principle behind the popularity of certain saints, specifically virgin martyrs and other helper saints, on late medieval screens was their intercessory role.[21] Saints such as St Anne might be invoked to aid fecundity, or St Apollonia in the management or prevention of toothache, and they were very approachable for the laity, sited as they were on the western face of the lower part of the screen. Other figures could appear too, such as kings and prophets.[22] I have argued elsewhere that the choice of saints on the screen at St Mary's, North Tuddenham reflects the fact that plague was endemic in that area at the date it was made.[23] The subject matter of screens might also reflect the distribution of the congregation in front of it as at St Mary's, North Elmham or St Helen's, Ranworth in Norfolk and St Andrew's, Westhall in Suffolk where female saints grace the north range and male saints the south, mirroring the segregation of the genders in church. The screen at Ranworth is unusual in being one of those examples where the tradition was inverted, as the women's side appears to have been the south side of the church where the nave altar was dedicated to the Holy Kinship.[24]

East Anglian screens were carved and constructed in oak, with at least some of the carving being finished *in situ*. Oak was often of two grades, local and imported. The imported wood was usually straight-grained Baltic boards and the bigger beams were more erratically grained local wood. Once the work of the carpenters was complete, the screen was painted as and when funds permitted. Although many screens have now been stripped of their original paint, fragments of paint have been found on all but a couple of the hundreds of screens in the East Anglian region.

The painting of screens from *c.*1400 until the beginning of the Tudor period followed a fairly standard model, with slight variations or signature features found between different workshops. Screens were usually covered with a white chalk ground, bound in animal glue, sometimes followed by a lead white priming and subsequent layers in drying oil. The mullions and upper fenestration were often painted in white, red and green and gilded, and the mouldings framing the dado panels decorated with floral patterns and barber's pole decoration. Blue pigments were used for the canopy of the loft, which in surviving examples is star-studded or angel-bedecked.[25]

Underdrawing was usually undertaken using a carbon black medium. The backgrounds of the figure panels were decorated alternately in copper green and vermilion and these were in turn decorated with stencils in gold and sometimes silver leaf, which is typically now tarnished to black. Figure painting was usually fairly calligraphic in tone, with flesh paint outlined in brown or black. The limited modelling of form was often done in highlights and glazes over mid-tones. A repeat casting method known as tin relief was fairly commonly used in East Anglia, but is not found on the more intricately carved Devon screens.

East Anglian Tudor-period screens have much the same structure, and broadly the same materials and handling of ornamental detailing, as their predecessors. However, during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, England was very open to artistic influence especially from France, the Low Countries and Rhine, both from imported works of art and imported artists. This influence came to be reflected in both the iconography and style of painting on rood screens by *c.*1500, as can be seen at St Mary the Virgin, Wiggenhall, Norfolk (Fig. 3).

Both Devon and East Anglia were influenced according to their respective geographical positions. Devon had an influx of Breton craftsmen responsible for screens, as both surviving screens and written evidence indicates.[26] The influence of Breton craftsmen and design spread wider than the presence of craftsmen and can be seen too in the incidental detail of West Country screens made by English craftsmen.

East Anglia's deep involvement with the cloth trade led to significant cultural influence from the Low Countries including the Burgundian Netherlands and Rhineland. Charles Tracy and Hugh Harrison have convincingly demonstrated the Spring chantry in St Peter and St Paul, Lavenham, Suffolk, to be Flemish influenced, in their view perhaps the work of second generation immigrants.[27] Thomas Spring III was himself a wealthy clothier and his chantry chapel screen demonstrates his taste for continental influenced design. Antwerp was a leading centre for artistic production and export. By the early sixteenth century, records show that numerous small-scale, ready-made works of art were imported into England including books of hours and altarpieces.

Towards the latter end of the pre-Reformation period, from around 1500, a discernible shift in design appears to have taken place, powerfully influenced by continental print sources and the new style we have come to term 'Renaissance'.

Landscape and ideas of recessional space became an increasing factor in panel compositions, and narrative scenes rather than iconic saints increased in popularity. This interest in landscape also came about on West Country screens, as evident at St Manarch's, Lanreath in Cornwall. Devon is also notable for its adoption of Classical motifs, in several cases, female sybils are to be found depicted on the dados of screens.[28]

Screen designers and carpenters accommodated for this by widening the dado panels, and sometimes no longer subdividing them, as can be seen on the screen at St Andrew's, Wellingham, Norfolk (Fig. 4). Taking just one element of the structure of screens, the transom rail cross-sectional shape, it is easy to visualise change in design over time (Fig. 5). The simple square-sectioned transom rails of the fourteenth century gave way to the polygonal design of perpendicular screens in the fifteenth. There was then a trend towards screen dados becoming larger and more complex into the sixteenth century.

Influence came directly from abroad through the copying of continental prints. Byam Shaw first noted that two saints, Peter and Andrew, on the screen at St Mary's, Worstead in Norfolk were derived from Schongauer prints, likely through copies such as those by Israhel von Meckenem. John Mitchell later noted that the St Simon on the Worstead screen derived from a Lucas van Leyden St Peter.[29] The Lucas van Leyden Apostle series dates to *c*.1510, the Worstead screen is dated 1512 and must have appeared strikingly contemporary when new. The two surviving panels at Tacolneston, Norfolk, were identified by Strange and Mitchell respectively as having derived from Lucas van Leyden and Monogrammist FVB.[30]

Once print sources became popular as an inspiration or guide for panel composition, the use of alternating green and red backgrounds adorned with stencils

declined, replaced instead by landscapes or gilded cloths of honour. Where red and green stencilled backgrounds were retained, they were turned into cloths of honour, sometimes held by angels behind the saints. By the sixteenth century, there are even instances of portraiture on screens, as at North Tuddenham, where the figure of St Sebastian is painted in a likeness of Henry VII (Fig. 6).

As well as changes in painting style, there were some commensurate alterations in painting technique on late-medieval screens. This mainly manifests itself in the increased use of modelling, as can be seen when comparing figures from the rood screens at All Saints, Carleton Rode, Norfolk and St Andrew's, Bramfield, Suffolk (Fig. 7). This change can even be seen within the same workshop when comparing the handling of St Philip's basket of bread at Ranworth, Norfolk and on the later screen at St Edmund's, Southwold, Suffolk. Both instances demonstrate artists' newfound interests in depicting recessional space and a more naturalistic depiction of light.

Duffy has demonstrated that the most active years for rood loft building were between 1490–1520 based on Norfolk and Suffolk will bequests.[31] In his view, the slight reduction in bequests between 1520 and 1540 more likely indicates that by this date most churches had completed the construction and decoration of their screens rather than being a sign of impending reform.

The impact of Reformation on medieval rood lofts

The dissolution officially sanctioned the destruction, dismantling and sometimes sale of the fittings of monastic churches, including screens and lofts.[32] From 1536, cult images in conventual and parochial settings were also targeted for destruction.[33] Despite this, the building of parochial rood lofts continued well into the reign of

Henry VIII as shown by documentary and physical remains, for example at Wellingham, Norfolk, where the screen is inscribed with the date 1532. A large bequest was left by a John Jamys to make the rood loft as late as 1538 in St Mary's, Banham, Norfolk.[34] Records show that rood lofts were made as late as 1546 in the case of St Andrew's, East Allington, Devon. The makers of the screen at Atherington, Devon, sought redress for a lack of payment for their early 1540s work through the chancery courts between 1544 and 1547.[35]

While the 1536 Royal Injunctions had criticised the cult of images, relics and pilgrimage, those two years later were more forceful, forbidding both pilgrimage and outward manifestations of devotion to the dead and to the cult of saints.[36] However, tapers and candles were still permitted to be burnt before the Rood and there was to be no officially sanctioned destruction of the Rood or any part of its supporting structure at that date, although attacks did take place between 1538 and 1540.[37] By the death of Henry VIII in January 1547, pilgrimage sites, the shrines of saints and the entire monastic system had been taken apart.[38] The building of rood lofts had slowed in pace, and those in the monastic setting had been destroyed or sold.

It was under Edward VI (1547–1553) that the building of lofts halted, images were attacked and Roods were burnt. The Injunctions of 1547 led to Royal Visitations from September.[39] The Visitations led to the destruction of many images, but the distinction between a used and a misused image was not clarified until the end of 1547. The official order to remove all images from London came first, and was extended by Cramner to the rest of the country in February 1548.[40] All images were to be removed from churches and destroyed and the campaign of destruction lasted many years. By 1550, ownership of religious images would lead to fines and imprisonment.[41]

The destruction of of Roods and rood groups by iconoclasts was so successful that only five or so fragments of British Roods have survived. Rood beams, like the one at St Mary's, Tunstead in Norfolk, are more common in their survival, although where figurative, they too suffered destruction; a sole surviving Golgotha rood beam remains in St Andrew's, Cullompton, Devon. Under Edward VI, screens themselves were retained and acquired a new function. Where the Rood and its attendant figures had once stood, royal arms were now positioned.[42] However, it was not until the reign of Elizabeth I that rood lofts, in the modern understanding of the term – the parapets – were officially condemned. Clearly in a time of great turmoil and without official sanction, some reformers such as Bishop Hooper in 1551–52, sought and succeeded in the abolition of some rood lofts.[43]

Some Roods, rood lofts and tympana were restored during the Catholic reign of Mary (1553–1558). An example can be found at St Catherine's, Ludham in Norfolk, where the chancel arch tympanum was put back after its discovery in the rood stair in 1879.[44] Also present at Ludham, now on the chancel side of the arch, is an Elizabethan royal arms on canvas, used to cover the tympanum during Elizabeth's reign and after. The wooden tympanum is pre-Reformation in date and has two or more phases of painting, one likely Marian in date.[45] The figure of Christ and the Cross has been crudely added over blank space on the tympanum previously hidden by statuary of the same subject. This tympanum must have survived the 1540s, in the hope that it would one day be put back and it was modified in Mary's reign and then covered up during Elizabeth's.

1559 was a year of widespread image destruction, both of new images created during Mary's reign and of the earlier examples that had re-emerged from hiding. The Elizabethan order of 10th October 1561 made it explicit that the partition between the

nave and the chancel was to be kept, but for the first time, rood lofts were ordered to be removed.[46] Despite the orders to remove both, some Roods and rood lofts must have survived into the seventeenth century as both the 28 August, 1643 Ordinance and May, 1644 Ordinance explicitly state their prohibition.[47] Determining the date of iconoclastic damage such as the scratching of eyes and destruction of prayer clauses is, however, rarely possible.[48]

Conclusion

The technical study, specifically of carpentry joints, shows that Tudor screens, those on the eve of the Reformation, can be identified with a degree of certainty, due to a construction change in rood screen manufacture in East Anglia. This same change is observed elsewhere in England, although at present does not have the dating evidence tied to the physical evidence. Between 1485 and 1538 screen production was widespread and well-established. Screen painting in the Tudor period can be seen to be both continuing a well-worn tradition, technically and iconographically, and capable of adopting the latest continental fashions.

However, the Reformation's religious turmoil meant that rood lofts such as St Andrew's, North Burlingham, finished only in 1536, were probably defaced just ten years later, and their lofts and Roods destroyed. The making of rood screens ceased from the accession of Edward VI, and extensive dismantling, deliberate whitewashing and widespread iconoclasm likely dates from this period. A brief Catholic revivalist period under Mary between 1553 and 1558, is perhaps best exemplified in East Anglia at Ludham and by screen at Hubberholme in Yorkshire which is dated 1558 and was signed by its carpenter, William Jake. In both cases, craftsmen mended what was already present or locally scavenged, perhaps from the Premonstratensian

monastery at Coverham Abbey. Hubberholme's loft is earlier in date than the parts Jake constructed and signed and Ludham saw the addition of a painted cross where a sculpted one previously stood. Many parishes lacked the means to replace Roods, lofts and screens and many sculptures were replaced by cheap canvas at this time. Within the span of a couple of decades, it appears that the craft structures and traditions of rood screen carpentry and painting were fractured beyond repair.

About the author: Dr Lucy Wrapson is a senior paintings conservator at the Hamilton Kerr Institute, University of Cambridge, specialising in the conservation and technical study of polychrome medieval wood and panel paintings.

Captions

Fig 1: Drawing showing the constituents parts of an East Anglian rood screen and their names. © Hamilton Kerr Institute, University of Cambridge.

Fig 2: Rood screen transom joints: Ranworth, Norfolk (mason's mitre, dated c. 1479), and Southwold, Suffolk (scribed, dated *c*.1500–10). Note the difference in where the joint appears on the front of the transom in each case. © Hamilton Kerr Institute, University of Cambridge.

Fig 3: St Catherine of Alexandria and St Barbara from the south side of the rood screen at Wiggenhall, St Mary the Virgin, Norfolk. The saints stand in front of the kind of wall seen on northern European altarpieces of the same period. © Hamilton Kerr Institute, University of Cambridge.

Fig 4: St Michael depicted on the south side of the rood screen at St Andrew's. Wellingham, Norfolk.

Fig 5: Three periods of transom cross-sectional moulding profiles on East Anglian screens. On the left are those of fourteenth-century date, noted from the style of the screens. In the middle are mid-late fifteenth-century examples, and to the right are the sixteenth-century examples. The dates are either inscribed dates or averaged will bequest dates. Not to scale. © Hamilton Kerr Institute, University of Cambridge.

Fig 6: Rood screen panel, St Sebastian, *c.*1495-1520, oil on panel, North Tuddenham, Norfolk. © Hamilton Kerr Institute, University of Cambridge.

Fig 7: Rood screen panel, *St Simon*, *c.*1460, oil on panel, Carleton Rode, Norfolk compared with *St Matthew*, *c.*1500, oil on panel, Bramfield, Suffolk. © Hamilton Kerr Institute, University of Cambridge.

---

[1] For more on this see J. Jung, 'Seeing through screens, the Gothic enclosure as frame', in S. Gerstel (ed.), *Thresholds of the Sacred*, (Dumbarton Oaks, 2006), 185–213; J. Jung, 'Beyond the barrier: the unifying role of the choir screen in Gothic churches', *Art Bulletin*, 82 (2000), 622–57.
[2] A. Vallance, *English Church Screens*, (London, 1936), 31–47; F. Bond, *Screens and Galleries in English Churches*, (London, 1908), 87-93.
[3] For Brittany see Y. Pelletier, *Les jubés de Bretagne*, (Ouest-France, 1986). For Eye see A. Baker, *English Panel Paintings 1400–1558: A survey of figure paintings on East Anglian rood-screens*, (London, 2011), 138–9.
[4] Vallance, *English Church Screens*, 31–2. For 'aler', see E. Hobhouse, *Church-wardens' accounts of Croscombe, Pilton, Patton, Tintinhull, Morebath, and St. Michael's, Bath, ranging from A.D. 1349 to* 1560, Somerset Record Society, 4, (London, 1890), 79, 88, 92, 93, 95.
[5] R. Wheeler, *The Medieval Church Screens of the Southern Marches*, (Little Logaston, 2006).
[6] Vallance, *English Church Screens*, 91 cites C. R. Norcliffe's 1862 paper for the *Yorkshire Architectural Society*.
[7] I have published a more detailed version of this methodology in L. Wrapson, 'Towards new methodological approaches for examining rood screens', in S. Bucklow, R. Marks and L. Wrapson (eds.), *The Art and Science of the Church Screen in Medieval Europe: Making, Meaning, Preserving*, (Woodbridge, 2016), 45–70.
[8] *Ibid.*

[9] For the destruction of the record office see https://swheritage.org.uk/devon-archives/visit/local-studies-library/. However, Devon wills from the Prerogative Court at Canterbury have survived, and a sample 97 out of 626 were read by Williams in the course of his doctorate on Devon screens, yielding 6 references to West Country screens, 2 of which are extant: M. A. Williams, 'Medieval English Roodscreens with Special Reference to Devon', (doctoral thesis, University of Exeter, 2008).
[10] L. Wrapson and E. Sinclair, 'The polychromy of Devon screens: preliminary analytical results', in Bucklow et al (eds.), *The Church Screen*, 150–174, esp. 155.
[11] This is dealt with in my PhD Thesis: L. J. Wrapson, 'Patterns of Production: A Technical Art Historical Study of East Anglia's Late Medieval Screens', (doctoral thesis, University of Cambridge, 2013). It will also be the subject of my forthcoming book.
[12] Much of the dating is underpinned by the following work: S. Cotton, 'Mediæval roodscreens in Norfolk – their construction and painting dates', *Norfolk Archaeology*, 40: 1, (1987), 44–54; P. Northeast, 'Suffolk churches in the late middle ages: the evidence of wills', in C. Harper-Bill, Carole Rawcliffe and R. Wilson (eds), *East Anglia's History: Studies in Honour of Norman Scarfe*, (Woodbridge, 2002), 93-106; P. Northeast (ed.), *Wills of the Archdeanery of Sudbury 1439–1474.Wills from the Register 'Baldewyne'. Pt 1: 1439–61*, (Woodbridge, 2001); P. Northeast and H. Falvey (eds), *Wills of the Archdeanery of Sudbury 1439–1474. Wills from the Register 'Baldewyne'. Pt 2: 1461–1474*, (Woodbridge, 2010); S. Cotton, H. Lunnon and L. Wrapson, 'Medieval rood screens in Suffolk: their construction and painting dates', *Proceedings of the Suffolk Institute for Archaeology and History*, 43, Part 2, (2014), pp. 219–234. For example, at Cawston in Norfolk, the first known bequest to the screen is in 1460 and the last in 1507, and a range of different painters from different workshops were involved (in my view four).
[13] Wrapson, 'Patterns of Production'.
[14] L. Wrapson, 'New methodological approaches'.
[15] C. Tracy and H. Harrison, *The Choir-Stalls of Amiens Cathedral*, (Reading, 2004).
[16] T. Howson, 'Suffolk church screens: their production in the late middle ages and their conservation today', (PG Dip in Building Conservation, Architectural Association, 2009), vol. 1, 42, fig. 4.6.
[17] The antiquarian Blomefield's notebooks reveal that there was previously a date of 1474 inscribed on the doors of the North Elmham screen (I am grateful to David King for finding and passing on this information). The date was not transcribed into Blomefield's published volume.
[18] H. Harrison and J. West, 'West Country rood screens: construction and practice', in Bucklow et al (eds.), *The Church Screen*, 123–149.
[19] I have explored screens of the Tudor period in the following publication: L. J. Wrapson, 'A Medieval Context for the Artistic Production of Painted Surfaces in England: Evidence from East Anglia (*c.*1400–50)', in T. Cooper, A. Burnstock, M. Howard and E. Town, *Painting in Britain 1500–-1630, Production, Influences and Patronage*, (London, 2015), 166–175.
[20] Wrapson, 'Patterns of Production', 555. Baker, following Pevsner, dates it to *c.*1400. Baker, *English panel paintings 1400–1558*, 129-30.
[21] E. Duffy, 'The parish, piety and patronage in late medieval East Anglia: the evidence of screens', in K. French, G. Gibbs and B. Kümin (eds.), *The Parish in English Life, 1400-1600*, (Manchester, 1997), 133–62; E. Duffy, 'Holy maydens, holy wyfes: the cult of women saints in fifteenth- and sixteenth-century England', in W. J. Sheils and D. Wood (eds.), *Women in the Church: papers read at the 1989 Summer Meeting and the 1990 Winter Meeting of the Ecclesiastical History Society*, (Oxford and Cambridge), 175–96.
[22] J. Luxford 'Sacred kingship, genealogy and the late medieval rood screen: Catfield and beyond', in Bucklow et al (eds.), *The Church Screen*, (Woodbridge, 2016),
[23] This article will form part of a forthcoming festschrift.
[24] M. Naydenova Slade, 'Images of the Holy kinship in England, *c.*1170 to *c.*1525', (doctoral thesis, Courtauld Institute of Art, London, 2008), 148–50.
[25] Visible still at St Andrew's, Bramfield, Suffolk and All Saints, Tilbrook, Cambridgeshire (formerly Hunts).
[26] J. Allan, 'Breton woodworkers in the immigrant communities of south-west England, 1500–1550' *Post-Medieval Archaeology*, 48: 2 (2014), 320–56.

[27] C. Tracy, C. and H. Harrison, 'Thomas Spring's Chantry and Parclose at Lavenham, Suffolk', *Journal of the British Archaeological Association*, 164, (2011), 221–59.
[28] A. Baker, 'Representations of Sibyls on Rood-screens in Devon', *Report and Transactions of the Devonshire Association*, 136, (2004), 71–97.
[29] J. Mitchell, 'Painting in East Anglia around 1500: the continental connection', in J. Mitchell (ed.), *England and the Continent in the Middle Ages: studies in memory of Andrew Martindale*, (Stamford, 2000), 365–80.
[30] Mitchell 'Painting in East Anglia around 1500', 376 and E. F. Strange, 'Notes on the rood-screen in Tacolneston church, Norfolk', *Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries of London*, Second series, 19 (1903), 142–6
[31] Duffy, 'The parish, piety and patronage', 138.
[32] I have published an extended version of this section of the paper in L. Wrapson, 'East Anglian medieval church screens. A brief guide to their physical history', *Bulletin of the Hamilton Kerr Institute*, 4, (2013), 33–47.
[33] M. Aston, *England's Iconoclasts, vol. 1 Laws against Images*, (Oxford, 1988), 225.
[34] Cotton, 'Mediæval roodscreens in Norfolk', 46.
[35] The National Archives (K), C1/1116.
[36] E. Duffy, *The Stripping of the Altars: Traditional Religion in England 1400–1580*, (New Haven and London, 1992), 407.
[37] Vallance, *English Church Screens*, 5.
[38] R. Deacon and P. Lindley, *Image and Idol: Medieval Sculpture*, (London 2001), 33.
[39] Duffy, *The Stripping of the Altars*, 448–77.
[40] R. Marks, *Image and Devotion in Late Medieval England*, Stroud 2004, 263–4.
[41] *Ibid.*
[42] Only a single set of Edwardian royal arms survives, at Westerham, Kent. D. MacCulloch, *Tudor Church Militant. Edward VI and the Protestant Reformation*, (London 1999), 16.
[43] Vallance, *English Church Screens*, 77.
[44] P. Mortlock and C. V. Roberts, *The Guide to Norfolk Churches*, (Cambridge 2007), 179. The royal arms, which must have historically covered the wooden tympanum, is on canvas and was placed in its current position, facing east, on a new stretcher in the 1970s. I am grateful to Pauline Plummer for this information.
[45] From the ground there appear to be two schemes, but it cannot be ruled out that a close examination may reveal more layers or campaigns.
[46] Vallance, *English Church Screens*, 86.
[47] J. Spraggon, *Puritan Iconoclasm in the English Civil War*, (Woodbridge 2003), 79.
[48] T. Cooper (ed.), *The Journal of William Dowsing: Iconoclasm in East Anglia during the English Civil War*, (Woodbridge 2001), 106. Citing Weever's 1631 reference to damage to brasses, Cooper concludes that prayer clause mutilation cannot therefore be taken as a conclusive evidence of 1640s iconoclasm.